

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-4, and 6-35 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1, 6, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,926,159 to Matsuzaki et al. ("Matsuzaki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,508 to Ono et al. ("Ono") and U.S. Application Publication No. US-2002/0184626 A1 to Darbee et al. ("Darbee et al.").

Claims 1, 6, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Matsuzaki in view of Ono and Darbee et al.

Claims 3, 4, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki and Ono and Darbee et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,728,936 to Guscott et al ("Guscott").

Claims 7-9, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki and Ono and Darbee et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 08-035759 to Chikako ("Chikako").

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki, Ono, Darbee et al. and Chikako as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,676 to Callahan, Jr. et al. ("Callahan") and U.S. Patent No. 6,323,851 B1 to Nakanishi ("Nakanishi").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki and Ono and Darbee et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,901 B1 to Adler et al. ("Adler").

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Ono and Darbee et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,008,787 to Kondoh ("Kondoh").

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki, Ono, Darbee et al. and Kondoh as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,027 B1 to Unno et al. ("Unno").

Claim 28 is under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki, Ono, Darbee et al. and Kondoh as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Guscott.

Claims 25, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Unno, and further in view of Ono.

Claims 18, 29, 30, and 33-35 are allowed.

There is an indication in the Office Action that the Examiner has not objected or accepted the drawings. Applicants respectfully request the approval of the replacement drawing for Figure 5 transmitted with the Letter to Official Draftsperson filed on February 14, 2003.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19-21, 24, 27, 28, 31, and 32 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended to depend from allowed claim 33. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from claim 22. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not obvious in view of the art of record. Nevertheless, to move the application to issue, the present amendment,

Application No. 09/527,368
Amendment dated April 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

which cancels some claims and amends others, is submitted to clearly put the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19-21, 24, 27, 28, 31, and 32 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims are moot.

By virtue of the amendments above, claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 22, and 24-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowed claim 33. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 33 is allowable.

New Claims

New claim 36 finds support in Figs. 4-6 and 13; in the specification at page 15, line 14 to page 16, line 8; at page 33, line 10 to page 35, line 20; and in originally filed claims 1, 7, 10, and 11. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 36 distinguishes the art of record for at least the same reasons that claim 33 distinguishes the art of record.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.


This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Application No. 09/527,368
Amendment dated April 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. DeHaemer
Registration No. 39,164
Attorney for Applicants

MJD/llb:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3335
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
April 27, 2006